

This record is a partial extract of the original cable. The full text of the original cable is not available.

UNCLAS SECTION 01 OF 02 THE HAGUE 000349

SIPDIS

STATE FOR AC/CB, NP/CBM, VC/CCB, L/ACV, IO/S
SECDEF FOR OSD/ISP
JOINT STAFF FOR DD, PMA-A FOR WTC
COMMERCE FOR BIS (GOLDMAN)
NSC FOR CHUPA
WINPAC FOR LIEPMAN

E.O. 12958: N/A

TAGS: [PARM](#) [PREL](#) [CWC](#)

SUBJECT: CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION (CWC) - OCPF SITE
SELECTION METHODOLOGY WORKSHOP

This is CWC-19-04.

11. (U) The U.S. hosted a technical experts workshop on February 5 to facilitate understanding of the Swiss/U.S. Other Chemical Production Facility (OCPF) site selection methodology proposal. The morning session focused on the rationale and mechanics of the proposal. In the past, acceptance of the methodology by States Parties has been hampered by a lack of understanding of the mathematics in an audience composed mainly of non-technical diplomats. The afternoon session focused on political issues associated with implementation. The workshop was a success in fostering understanding among delegations of the history and rationale of the methodology, though serious political issues remain unresolved.

12. (U) U.S. expert Dr. James Bradley presented to delegates the Swiss/U.S. proposed methodology for OCPF site selection, emphasizing the proposal's ability to incorporate equitable geographic distribution of OCPF inspections, Technical Secretariat (TS) preferences, and proposals from each State

SIPDIS

Party. First, geographic distribution is distributed by weighting the number of each country's declared inspectable OCPF facilities. This shifts the burden of inspections away from countries with small OCPF industries to those with larger industries while not overwhelming the inspection burden of the countries with the most declared OCPF facilities. TS information points are restricted to no more than five percent per facility, no more than 15 percent per country, and must add up to a total of 100. Finally, any State Party may nominate OCPF facilities using whatever method it chooses as long as its points add up to 100. The nomination points are the average of all such submissions.

13. (U) Several questions related to implementation, confidentiality, effect of collusion, effect on

SIPDIS

industrialized countries and specifics of the two-stage process were posed to Dr. Bradley and were answered before the group. Discussion centered on the nomination points, focusing on two case studies. The first considered the impact of collusion, defined as a group of States Party working together to coordinate their nominations against OCPF facilities in a specific country. In this instance, the impact of collusion is minimized when the number of colluders is small relative to the number of States Party submitting nominations. If the number of submitting States Party is small, the impact of collusion can be substantial. The Swiss/U.S. proposal restricts the potential impact of collusion by requiring nominations from at least 25 countries before fully including the averaged nomination points.

14. (U) The presentation then suggested possible options to allow States Party with small National Authorities and limited resources to fully participate in the OCPF site selection process. There currently are around 4000 inspectable OCPF facilities, but to familiarize itself a State Party would need to acquire and review all declarations. Instead, States Party could use a "rule," such as "assign my nomination points to the phosphorous, sulphur, flourine (PSF) sites in the five countries on my borders;" or "assign my nomination points to the ten countries with the largest number of declarable OCPF facilities;" or "spread my nomination points the same way that the TS spreads its information points."

15. (U) Finally, the U.S. delegation discussed ways States Party might submit nominations and distributed a non-paper with a possible nomination format which included elements such as regional group, a list of countries, PSF, and non-PSF facilities. Rather than debate which elements might appear on such a future form, the U.S. delegation invited attendees to fill out the non-form and the U.S. would "run the numbers" to demonstrate how the method might work. The intent of the exercise was to ensure States Party that options exist

between not allocating any points and analyzing every declaration to allocate points appropriately. Forms were collected from 15 of the approximately 45 attendees, and rules used ranged from PSF facilities in a regional group to a list of countries of interest. The results were distributed to WEOG members on February 10 and will be discussed in WEOG on February 17.

16. (U) The facilitator (Paul Wilke, Netherlands) chaired the afternoon session that focused on political discussions. The TS presented the A14 selection method used currently. Following this discussion, delegates began to debate the political ramifications of implementation of a new methodology. Some asked whether the A14 could be adapted to accommodate State Party input; others noted their thorough dislike of the A14 methodology. No one argued that A14 meets treaty requirements or cannot be improved. Italy raised its strong concerns regarding possible politicization of the process by allowing the TS and States Party to allocate points against individual countries. Brazil noted that any methodology must remain consistent with the considerations and limitations articulated in the confidentiality annex. India was the most vocal in questioning the rationale behind first selecting a State Party and then a OCPF facility in that country, as well as why the three weighting factors -- in particular the geographic distribution -- would play roles at both stages of the selection process.

17. (U) Delegations responded positively to the Swiss/U.S. discussions and thanked the U.S. expert for his detailed, comprehensible presentation of what in the past appeared to be complex formulas and ideas. Delegations look forward to discussing the concepts further in a future round of industry intersessional consultations, and delegates asked the TS to evaluate the workload and fiscal impact introduction of the Swiss/U.S. site selection methodology would have on the Declarations Branch. Wilke also requested the U.S. expert have available for delegates in March a paper describing the Swiss/U.S. proposal and the case studies presented.

18. (U) Javits sends.
SOBEL